

I feel weird doing this because it seems condescending, but I feel like nobody understands what I talk about, and doesn't address the points I make so I just prove it, by breaking them down into the form of theorems.

- rule no
- 1 Heck v Humphrey theorem
(\neg exhaust & remedy & \neg ineffective) \supset \neg standing)
 - 2 Heck v Humphrey footnote 9 exception theorem
($(($ congressional enactment \vee preclusion rule) \supset standing)
 - 3 Younger v Harris theorem
($(($ state action \supset comity) & (comity \supset abstain))
 - 4 Younger v Harris exception theorem
($(($ congressional enactment \supset \neg abstain)
 - 5 ($(($ bad faith \vee harassment) \supset \neg abstain)
 - 6 ($(($ state remedy) \supset \neg abstain)
 - 7 ($(($ utterly unconstitutional) \supset \neg abstain)
 - 8 Copyright sovereign immunity 17 USC §301, §511
($(($ copyright infringement & state) \supset (\neg comity & congressional enactment & preclusion & \neg state remedy)

& = and \vee = or \neg = not \supset = if then \otimes = exclusive or
See wikipedia on logical deduction and first order logic

9 First amendment theorem
(First amendment \supset Standing)

Deduction of postulates

Axioms

10 (Copyright infringement & State & first amendment)

First amendment \supset Standing

By rule 9

\neg exhaust $\supset \neg$ Standing

By a costar rules

Standing & \neg Standing

therefore false

Copyright infringement & State \supset (Comity & act of Congress & \neg state remedy & Preclusion) By rule 8

11 (Comity & act of Congress & preclusion) must be true
(act of Congress & Preclusion) \supset Standing by rule 2

((Standing & \neg Standing) & Standing) \supset Standing by ^{reductio} ad absurdum

(State action \supset Comity) & (Comity \supset abstain) by rule 3

(State action \supset abstain)

by inference

abstain

by a costar rule

(\neg state remedy $\supset \neg$ abstain)

by rule 6

(act of Congress $\supset \neg$ abstain)

by rule 4

abstain & \neg abstain & \neg abstain $\supset \neg$ abstain

\neg abstain

by reductio ad absurdum

note i also allege bad faith and harrassment and for utterly and irredeibly unconstitutional. please proceed to the following pages for those deductions.

utterly unconstitutional theorem.

as applied to ors. 163,472 in every clause.

1) disseminate: under 17 usc 301 intimate image under United states v stevens Content based restriction

1a) harass: restrictions only on an unwilling listener.

humiliate: Boos v Barry emotional impact, injure:

Rau v St Paul hostility or favoritism, disclosed: 17 usc 301

internet website: Commerce clause. Identifiable

image: vagueness (stick drawings named or artistic

parody named) other person: Content based restriction

us v stevens. intimate parts visible: Content based

restriction memoirs v massachusetts. engaged in

Sexual Conduct: Content based restriction us v playboy.

1b) other person does not consent: prior restraint,

ex post facto impairment of contract. Disclosure:

17 usc 301, 17 usc 201. person knows or reasonably should

have known: Elonis v United states reasonable person

standard 1c) The other person: Boos v Barry secondary

effects not emotive impact. harassed: unwilling listener

humiliated: Boos v Barry emotive impact or injured: Boos v Barry

secondary effects disclosure: 17 usc 301. 1d) a reasonable

person: Elonis v United states reasonable person standard

harassed: unwilling listener. humiliated: Boos v Barry emotive

impact. injured: Rau v St Paul hostility or favoritism. disclosure:

17 usc 301. 4a) activity by law enforcement 17 usc 301, 201, 511

4b) Legitimate: Miller v California 4c) Legal proceedings 17 usc 511

4d) Law enforcement agency: 17 usc 511 4e Lawful public purpose

: United states v playboy 4f disclosure 17 usc 301, 4g 17 usc 301

fix = ((1a & 1b & 1c & 1d) & ~((4a v 4b v 4c v 4d v 4e v 4f (4f A v 4f B v 4f C)))

THE CONSTITUTION THE BILL OF RIGHTS THE FIRST AMENDMENT

utterly unconstitutional theorem
against whomever and whatever matter

$$f(x) = (1a \& 1b \& 1c \& 1d) \& \neg(4a \vee 4b \vee 4c \vee 4e \vee 4f(4fA \vee 4fB \vee 4fC))$$

"against whatever manner and against whomever"

$\sum_{x \in \infty} (x \vdash f(x))$ of all members in set x , the Law $f(x)$ is false

$1a(\sum(x_n)(y_n)(z_n)(\text{person}(x) \& \text{otherperson}(y) \& \text{intimate image}(z)) \& \text{intent}(\text{disclose}(\text{intimate image}(z) \& \text{Secondary effect}(\text{harrass}(x) \vee \text{humiliate}(y) \vee \text{injure}(y)))) \& \text{True}(x, y, z))$

there exists a person x_n , another person y_n , and a intimate image z_n and there is a secondary effect of y_n is harassed or y_n is humiliated or y_n is injured with all other conditions are assumed true.

$\text{intimate image}(\text{image}(z_n) \& \text{intimate}(z_n)) \& \neg(\text{image}(z_n) \supset \text{intimate}(z_n)) \supset \neg \text{Secondary effect}()$ - Boos v Barry

if an it is an image and it is intimate, rather than being intimate because of it being an image, there can be no secondary effect

$(a(z)(\text{intimate image}(\text{intimate}(z_n) \& \text{image}(z_n) \& \text{Secondary effect}(\text{true})) \& \text{true}()) \& \neg b(z)(\text{image}(z_{n+1}) \& \neg \text{intimate}(z_{n+1}) \& \text{Secondary effect}(\text{true}) \& \text{true}()) \supset \neg a(z))$

Rav v St Paul

if any law restricts an image, and it is intimate and it has a secondary effect, and there is no law against an image that is not intimate and it has the secondary effect then there shall be no law

Thus under any condition of an intimate image $f(x)$ is false.

Basis for deductions of motive

what I know is: 1) Vance had malice 2) I loved Vance but blame feminism 3) I wanted to make Vance go to therapy and stop divorce 4) Matthias Huber took over my non-profit opgameitforward@gmail.com account in Jan 2015 5) porn of me appears on 8ch.net on Jan 2015 6) Meagan Vance had my email passwords in our marriage contract 7) I threaten to sue them over it because ~\$5k worth of Steam™ redemption game codes meant for donation were taken 8) my workplace is 'bombarded' with the same allegations as from Vance (fraud, theft, rape) as is Thuy Huyen of PSU (romantic interest) 9) in April Vance asks to have our divorce end, girlfriend Amanda Parker move out and her in but changes her mind 10) she shows up with police to take a tea kettle already having her belongings and I tell her I will post her chats on meaganvance.net "11) She talks to April Kusters of PSU about the revenge porn law before it passes 12) April sent threats of arrest for "harassment" for reporting she had violated tro and academic plagiarism and Thuy Huyen's harassment to PSU. 13) Beardmosexual accused Mr Robin Gething of spreading porn, said he got access to it easily after digging into my personal life, and said it was to 'silence endo' (Barber) and calls it a crime. 14) I @mention Vance in the thread saying that her albino porn was out there 15) I tell Vance that her friends are spreading our porn, the next day when she is asking to get back together 16) She says I heard something about that but nothing else 17) She says in court "they were doing it to protect me" and "I knew they wouldn't spread it", and "it was in a folder called sexy". 18) the server had a password protection in 2010 when uploaded

Deductions of vance's motives

1. I have evidence of all but 4,78,9 but can Sipoena them
 if we assume its impossible to steal my password, that
 its impossible to take files off the server without a
 password, impossible to reset the password of opgameit
 forward@gmail.com without access to the recovery address.
 Then Someone must have given them the password.
2. If we assume its impossible to arrest Someone ex post
 facto for an action before the law was passed, that its
 impossible to arrest Someone for reporting them to the
 authorities, that its impossible to arrest Someone for
 putting your 'transgressions' online, then the method of
 arrest must of been by uploading the porn by Someone else
3. if we assume its impossible to embarrass a person without
 shame, if its impossible to protect vance by embarrassing me,
 if its impossible to protect vance or silence me without
 Coercion, then the act must have been for coercion.
4. if "digging into his personal life" and 'rather easily' excludes
 hacking, if goldstein testified that I had not caused
 even a momentary fault in his relationship with vance,
 If goldstein recieved an email telling him that vance
 cheated on him with me the day after the porn leaked, then
 the the cheating must have been related to the pornography
5. if Barber knew that she had the password and had
 given it to them, and thought that she had access
 to the porn under contract and had no problem with it,
 and Barber did not know it was a crime that intended
 to get him arrested and thought it was to embarrass him,
 then the real purpose was to mollify Barber and find
 if he knew about the law to avoid being arrested for it.